

## **REMARKS**

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 35-42 are pending in the application. No Claims have been cancelled.

### **I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 35-36 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,127,117 issued to Sano et al. (hereinafter “Sano”) in view of Khan et al (US-PGPUB 2001/0050875) and Miled et al. (US-PGPUB 2004/0091158). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sano, Khan and Miled, either taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, among other things, setting one or a plurality of aspect ratios and one or a plurality of sizes corresponding to a display unit of an external device. These features are recited as analogous elements in independent claims 35, 38, and 40. As discussed below, the cited art fails to teach or suggest these elements.

For instance, Sano discloses dividing the original image into a plurality of tiles that are compressed and encoded. See Sano, Abstract. The quantization rate in the vicinity of the boundary between each tile and its adjacent tile is set lower than the quantization rate at other parts. See Sano, column 10, lines 15, 16, and 22-27. Sano also discloses dividing the original image into a plurality of tiles, making a bit-plane division, and ordering the bit-planes according to the encoding sequence. See Sano, column 10, lines 8-13. The bit-plane in the vicinity of the tile boundary region (where the quantization rate is set low) is shifted with respect to the region that is distant from the tile boundary and that has the high quantization rate, so as to be included in the higher layer of the layers formed by the ordered bit-planes. See Sano, column 10, lines 22-27. Consequently, for these reasons, Sano fails to teach or suggest setting one or a plurality of aspect ratios and one or a plurality of sizes corresponding to a display unit of an external device as recited in claims 35, 38, and 40.

Khan et al. (US Pub-2001/0050875) discloses performing compression to a selected one of a finite predetermined set of sizes (e.g., minimum resolution thumbnail, or to quality of camera display, or to delete altogether), or operating on the selected image record with a

compression routine that compresses by a ration (paragraph 0150). Thus, Khan et al. does not teach or suggest, among other things, “setting on or a plurality of aspect ratios and one or a plurality of sizes”.

Miled also do not disclose such features.

Thus, in view of at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that the claims 35-36 and 38-41 are allowable over Sano, Khan and Miled, and such action is earnestly solicited at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 720 8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 22, 2008

/Michael J. Mallie/

Michael J. Mallie      Reg. No. 36,591

### **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the dates shown below.

May 22, 2008.

Angela M. Quinn  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

  
Signature

5-22-08  
Date